

**REMARKS**

**Summary of the Office Action**

Claims 1-4 and 7-10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by *Uehara* (USPN 6,046,974).

Claims 5-6 and 11-13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Uehara* in view of *Kim* (USPN 5,889,755).

**Summary of Response to Office Action**

Claim 11 has been amended to correct a technical informality.

Claims 14-16 have been added.

Accordingly, claims 1-16 are currently pending in this application.

**Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) and § 103(b)**

Claims 1-4 and 7-10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by *Uehara*. Claims 5-6 and 11-13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Uehara* in view of *Kim*. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections for at least the following reasons.

**Independent Claims 1 and 8**

Independent claims 1 and 8 stand rejected under § 102(e) as being anticipated by *Uehara*. In the Office Action at page 2 and again at page 4, the Examiner asserts that *Uehara* discloses a supporting mechanism including supporting members contacting with the supporting shaft on at least two contact points. Applicants respectfully submit, however, that *Uehara* merely discloses a structure composed of: (1) a screw shaft 15, which is inserted into a pair of cylindrical

insertion sections 13, 14; (2) an engaging projection 21, which is formed at the distal end of a plate spring member 20 so as to be pressed into a helical slot 15a in the screw shaft 15; and (3) a regulation wall 18a for regulating the position of the engaging projection 21 so as to prevent the engaging projection 21 from being out of the helical slot 15a. *Uehara* fails to disclose each of the supporting members contacting with the supporting shaft on at least two contact points, the contact point of each supporting member *simultaneously* coming into contact with the supporting shaft, and the at least two contact points being apart from each other, as recited in at least independent claims 1 and 8.

Specifically, with respect to *Uehara*'s structure as shown in Figure 5, the screw shaft 15 is in contact with the engaging projection 21 during normal operation. The screw shaft 15 only contacts regulation pieces 25 when the engaging projection 21 is partially disengaged from the slot 15a by an external shock. (See *Uehara*, col. 4, ll. 5-19.) Therefore, contrary to the Examiner's arguments, while the screw shaft 15 may be in contact with either member 24 or piece 25, there is no teaching or suggestion of it being in contact with both simultaneously. Hence, Applicants respectfully submit that *Uehara* does not disclose each and every feature of independent claims 1 and 8.

#### Independent Claim 11

Independent claim 11 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Uehara* in view of *Kim*. In the Office Action at page 5, the Examiner asserts that *Uehara* discloses a supporting mechanism including supporting members contacting with the supporting shaft on at least two contact points. On page 6, the Examiner acknowledges that *Uehara* does not teach a feeding shaft and relies upon *Kim* for this teaching. Applicants respectfully submit, however, that while *Kim* teaches an optical disc player, it does not cure the deficiencies of

*Uehara* as discussed in relation to claims 1 and 8 above. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that it would be impossible, without inventive activity, to reach the subject matter of the present invention as claimed even assuming, strictly *arguendo*, that there was proper motivation to combine *Uehara* and *Kim* together in any manner.

Remaining Claims

Applicants respectfully submit that the remaining rejections of dependent claims 2-7, 9-10 and 12-13 under § 102(e) and § 103(a) are also traversed and these dependent claims are allowable at least for the same reasons as their respective independent claims.

Applicants respectfully assert that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) and § 103(a) should be withdrawn because the applied art of record, whether taken singly or combined, does not teach or suggest each feature of independent claims 1, 8 and 11. As pointed out in MPEP § 2131, “[t]o anticipate a claim, the reference must teach every element of the claim.” Thus, “[a] claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.” *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. Of California*, 2 U.S.P.Q.2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Similarly, MPEP § 2143.03 instructs that “[t]o establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. *In re Royka*, 409 F.2d 981, 180 U.S.P.Q. 580 (CCPA 1974).” Furthermore, Applicants respectfully assert that dependent claims 2-7, 9-10 and 12-13 are allowable at least because of the dependence from their respective independent claims and the reasons set forth above.

**Newly Added Claims 14-16**

New dependent claims 14-16 have been added. Support for these claims can be found, *e.g.*, in Applicant's specification at page 12, lines 18-22 and Figures 1-3. Applicants respectfully submit that claims 14-16 are allowable at least because of their dependence from independent claims 1, 8 and 11, respectively, and the reasons set forth above.

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and the timely allowance of the pending claims. Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative to expedite prosecution of the application.

**EXCEPT** for issue fees payable under 37 C.F.R. § 1.18, the Commissioner is hereby authorized by this paper to charge any additional fees during the entire pendency of this application including fees due under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 and 1.17 which may be required, including any required extension of time fees, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account 50-0310. **This paragraph is intended to be a CONSTRUCTIVE PETITION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME in accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a)(3).**

Respectfully submitted,

**MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP**

Date: October 17, 2003

By: 

Angela S. Robinson  
Reg. No. 52,174

**Customer No. 009629**  
MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP  
1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20004  
Tel: (202) 739-3000  
Fax: (202) 739-3001